UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,994	01/25/2001	Trung M. Tran	5181-78600	7544

7590   09/20/2005

B. Noel Kivlin
Conley, Rose & Tayon, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, TX   78767-0398

EXAMINER
DALENCOURT, YVES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/770,994	TRAN, TRUNG M.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Yves Dalencourt	2157	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 June 2005</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-51</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-21,23-48,50 and 51</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) <u>7,22 and 49</u> is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 06/09/2005.

Response to Amendment

The examiner has acknowledged the amended claims 1, 10, 18, 26, 33, 36, 38, 42, and 48.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 - 6, 10 – 15, 18 – 21, 28 – 30, 42 – 45, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander James Burke (US 6,032,162; hereinafter Burke).

Regarding claims 1 - 2, 4, 10, 12, 14 - 15, 18, 26, 29, 42, 45, and 48, Burke

teaches a client computer system, a memory medium, and a method for connection to a

server computer system via a network (fig. 1), the client computer system (Burke

discloses a user terminal 10) comprising a processor (controller 30, fig. 1); a memory

coupled to the processor (inherently in user terminal 10); receive user authentication

information from the user (210, fig. 2; col. 3, lines 21 - 23); communicate with the server

computer system to authenticate the user, using the user authentication information

(col. 3, lines 23 - 30); send the bookmark information for storage in association with the

user by the server computer system (col. 3, line 64 through col. 4, line 2; col. 4, lines 36

- 43).

Regarding claim 3, Burke teaches the client computer system of claim 1, wherein

the processor of the client computer system is further operable to execute program

instructions stored in the memory to retrieve the bookmark information from the server

computer system, subsequently to said sending the bookmark information to the server

computer system (col. 7, lines 26 – 43; see claim 27).

Regarding claims 5, 11, 27, and 43, Burke teaches the client computer system

and method of claims 1, 10, 26, and 42, wherein the software application executing in

the client computer system is operable to enable a user to access the retrieved

bookmark information via a graphical user interface of the software application (col. 6,

lines 54 – 67; col. 7, lines 11 - 25).

Regarding claims 6, 13, 21, 28, and 44, Burke teaches the client computer

system and method of claims 1, 10, 26, and 42, wherein said enabling the user to

access the bookmark information via a graphical user interface comprises enabling the

user to access the bookmark information via a menu (col. 6, lines 54 – 67; col. 7, lines

11 - 25).

Regarding claims 19, 20, and 30, Burke teaches the client computer system of

claims 18 and 26, wherein said receiving the user input specifying the bookmark

information and said sending the bookmark information for storage by the server

computer system are performed by a first computer system, the method further

comprising a second computer system retrieving the bookmark information from the

server computer system (col. 5, line 62 through col. 6, line 23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 - 9, 16 - 17, 23 - 25, 31 - 32, 46 - 47, and 50 – 51 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander James Burke (US 6,032,162;

hereinafter Burke) in view of De Greef et al (US 6,549,217; hereinafter De Greef).

Regarding claims 8 - 9, 16 - 17, 23 - 25, 31 - 32, 46 - 47, and 50 - 51, Burke

teaches substantially all the limitations in claims 1, 10, 18, 26, 42, and 48, but fails to

specifically teach that said communicating with the server computer system to

authenticate the user is performed using the Lightweight Directory Access Protocol; and

wherein said sending the bookmark information for storage by the server computer

system is performed using the Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) (LDAP).

However, De Greef teaches, in the same field of endeavor, a system and method

for computer system management using bookmarks, wherein said communicating with

the server computer system to authenticate the user is performed using the Lightweight

Directory Access Protocol; and wherein said sending the bookmark information for

storage by the server computer system is performed using the Lightweight Directory

Access Protocol (LDAP) (LDAP) (col. 16, lines 32 - 47).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the teachings of Burke by using a Lightweight Directory

Access Protocol (LDAP) (LDAP) to allow communication with the server computer

system to authenticate the user, and to send the bookmark information for storage by

the server computer as evidenced by De Greef for the purpose of accessing by a simple

reference user's bookmarks anywhere that the directory server can be accessed,

thereby providing a convenient and user friendly bookmarking system.

Regarding claim 25, Burke teaches substantially all the limitations in claim 18,

but fails to specifically teach that in storing the bookmark information, the server

computer system is operable to add the bookmark information to existing bookmark

information that is already stored for the user.

However, De Greef teaches, in the same field of endeavor, a system and method

for computer system management using bookmarks, wherein in storing the bookmark

information, the server computer system is operable to add the bookmark information to

existing bookmark information that is already stored for the user (col. 7, lines 12 – 34).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the teachings of Burke by incorporating a server

computer system that is operable to add the bookmark information to existing bookmark

information that is already stored for the user as evidenced by De Greef for the purpose

of providing a convenient and user friendly bookmarking system

Claims 33 - 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Alexander James Burke (US 6,032,162; hereinafter Burke) in view of Mendelevitch et al

(EP 1030247 A2; hereinafter Mendelevitch).

Regarding claims 33 - 41, Burke teaches a method for sharing bookmark

information among different computer systems (fig. 1), the method comprising a first

computer system receiving user input specifying bookmark information), wherein the

bookmark information specifies a uniform resource locator (URL)(col. 3, lines 8 – 15 and

lines 64 - 66); the first computer system communicating with a server computer system

in order to store the bookmark information on the server computer system (col. 3, lines

15 – 30 and col. 3, line 66 through col. 4, line 2).

Burke teaches substantially all the limitations, but fails to specifically teach a

second computer system communicating with the server computer system in order to

retrieve the stored bookmark information; and receiving information from a first

computer that specifies a particular user and stores the bookmark information in

association with the particular user, and a request for the bookmark information from the second client computer system that specifies the same particular user.

However, Mendelevitch et al (EP 1030247 A2) teaches, in the same field of endeavor, a system and method for sharing bookmark information, which discloses a second computer system communicating with the server computer system in order to retrieve the stored bookmark information; and receiving information from a first computer that specifies a particular user and stores the bookmark information in association with the particular user, and a request for the bookmark information from the second client computer system that specifies the same particular user (paras. 0005, 0026 – 0028, and 0031 – 0035).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Burke's device by incorporating a second computer system communicating with the server computer system in order to retrieve the stored bookmark information; and receiving information from a first computer that specifies a particular user and stores the bookmark information in association with the particular user, and a request for the bookmark information from the second client computer system that specifies the same particular user as evidenced by Mendelevitch et al (EP 1030247 A2) for the purpose of avoiding transmission delays for the bookmark information, especially when available bandwidth between client(s) and server is low during periods of peak usage; thereby providing an efficient and reliable client/server system.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 22, and 49 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Adar et al (US Patent Number 6,493,702) discloses a system and method for searching and recommending documents in a collection using share bookmarks.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yves Dalencourt whose telephone number is (571) 272-3998. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:30AM - 6: 00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yves Dalencourt
Y. D
September 11, 2005

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100